



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,802	06/29/2001	Roger Bredow	RSW920010099US1	8307

26502 7590 08/03/2004

IBM CORPORATION
IPLAW IQ0A/40-3
1701 NORTH STREET
ENDICOTT, NY 13760

EXAMINER

CHEN, PO WEI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,802

Applicant(s)

BREDOW ET AL.

Examiner

Po-Wei (Dennis) Chen

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

In response to an Amendment received on April 16, 2004. This action is non-final.

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 14 and 16 are independent claims.

The present title of the invention is "Method and Computer Program Product for Using a Scrolling Computer Mouse to Select Pages of a Set of Linked Web Pages".

The Group Art Unit of the Examiner case is now 2676. Please use the proper Art Unit number to help us serve you better.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 14, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng et al. (US 6,211,878; refer to as Cheng herein).

3. Regarding claim 1, Cheng discloses a method for interacting and selecting information on a video device comprising:

A method for browsing a set of linked web pages; detecting scrolling output; responsive to the scrolling output; determining a URL of a web page; and accessing the web page by a web browser (line 65 of column 5 to line 53 of column 6 and Fig. 1-3; it is noted in displaying previous pages mode, previous web pages can be displayed using scrolling signal. And web pages are being accessed through HTML hyperlink (URL), lines 36-39 of column 14).

Art Unit: 2676

4. Regarding claim 14, the statements presented, above, with respect to claim 1 are incorporated herein.

5. Regarding claim 27, Cheng discloses a method for interacting and selecting information on a video device comprising:

Entering a scrolling mode prior to detecting the scrolling output (lines 8-53 of column 6 and Fig. 2; it is noted that the scrolling output is being detected and processed after the scrolling mode is activated).

6. Regarding claim 29, Cheng discloses a method for interacting and selecting information on a video device comprising:

The URL of the web page is determined in response only to the scrolling output (line 65 of column 5 to line 53 of column 6 and Fig. 1-3; it is noted in displaying previous pages mode, previous web pages can be displayed using scrolling signal. And web pages are being accessed through HTML hyperlink (URL), lines 36-39 of column 14). Thus, the URL is being determined in response only to the scrolling output).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US 6,211,878; refer to as Cheng herein) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Armstrong (US 6,198,473).

Art Unit: 2676

9. Regarding claim 2, Cheng does not disclose scrolling output from scroll mouse.

Armstrong discloses a computer mouse with enhance control buttons utilizing the device (lines 13-14 of column 6 and Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Cheng by substituting the inputting device of Armstrong for the inputting device of Cheng because Armstrong teaches that by using such inputting device will provide a low cost, ergonomically correct, familiar and desirable finger depressible input device for accessing web page (lines 55-57 of column 5, Armstrong).

10. Regarding claim 15, the statements presented, above, with respect to claim 2 are incorporated herein.

11. Claims 3-4, 8-13, 16-17, 21-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smailagic et al. (US 6,567,079; refer to as Smailagic herein) and further in view of Armstrong (US 6,198,473).

12. Regarding claims 3-4, Cheng discloses a method for interacting and selecting information on a video device comprising:

A method for using a scroll device to browse a set of linked web pages; displaying a source page that is a member of a set of linked web pages; detecting scrolling output of a scroll device while the source page is displayed; determining a sense of direction of the scrolling output; responsive to the sense of direction, determining a URL associated with a destination page that is a member of the set of linked web pages; accessing the destination web page by a web browser (line 65 of column 5 to line 53 of column 6 and Fig. 1-3; it is noted in displaying previous pages mode, previous web pages can be displayed using scrolling signal. And web pages are being accessed through HTML hyperlink (URL), lines 36-39 of column 14. While

Art Unit: 2676

claim recites a set of linked web pages, it is clear that previous pages can be considered as linked web pages. Also, it is clear that the scrolling signal can be advancing or regression depending on the scrolling direction.

A scroll wheel (lines 21-25 of column 7 and Fig. 3);

Cheng does not disclose scroll device is a scroll mouse. Armstrong discloses a computer mouse with enhance control buttons utilizing the device (lines 13-14 of column 6 and Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Cheng by substituting the inputting device of Armstrong for the inputting device of Cheng because Armstrong teaches that by using such inputting device will provide a low cost, ergonomically correct, familiar and desirable finger depressible input device for accessing web page (lines 55-57 of column 5, Armstrong).

13. Regarding claims 8-13, Cheng discloses a method for interacting and selecting information on a video device comprising:

The URL is associated with a next (forward) button of the source page (web browser) when the sense of direction is forward and the URL is associated with a previous (back) button of the source page (web browser) when the sense of direction is backward; the URL is the URL associated with a next (forward) button of the source page (web browser); the URL is the URL associated with a previous (back) button of the source page (web browser) (line 65 of column 5 to line 53 of column 6 and Fig. 1-3).

It is noted that the remote control function signals such as scrolling are correspond to specific web based function. It is clear that in scroll mode, the scrolling output can be advancing or regression to display pages accordingly, which corresponds to web based functions such as

Art Unit: 2676

forward or back button of the web browser. And since the remote control function signals of Cheng are being programmed to process HTML and/or JAVA, it is well known in the art that a next or previous button of a web page is also programmed in language such as HTML and/or JAVA. Thus, the scrolling output will be associated with same HTML links as the next or previous button of the web page.

14. Regarding claims 16-17 and 21-26, the statements presented above, with respect to claims 3-4 and 8-13 are incorporated herein.

15. Regarding claim 28, the statements presented, above, with respect to claim 27 are incorporated herein. Cheng does not disclose scroll mouse. However, this is known in the art taught by Armstrong, statements presented above, with respect to claim 3 are incorporated herein.

16. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US 6,211,878; refer to as Cheng herein) and Armstrong (US 6,198,473) as applied to claims 3 and 16 above, and further in view of Smailagic et al. (US 6,567,079; refer to as Smailagic herein).

17. Regarding claim 5, the combination of Cheng and Armstrong does not disclose the set of linked pages includes an on-line catalog. Smailagic discloses a portable computer system utilizing the linked pages (lines 17-20 of abstract and Fig. 9; while claim recites catalog, the term is broad enough to include the interactive electronic technical manuals disclosed by Smailagic). It would have been obvious to modify Cheng by substituting the link pages of Smailagic for the linked pages of Cheng because Smailagic teaches that by utilizing the linked pages will provide

Art Unit: 2676

user or workers an easy and inexpensive way to access desired information (line 67 of column 1 to line 37 of column 2).

18. Regarding claim 18, the statements presented above, with respect to claim 5 are incorporated herein.

19. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US 6,211,878; refer to as Cheng herein) and Armstrong (US 6,198,473) as applied to claims 3 and 16 above, and further in view of Barros (US 5,530,455).

20. Regarding claim 6, the combination of Cheng and Armstrong does not disclose that the set of linked pages includes a search list provided by an Internet search engine. Barros teaches a graphic-information flow method that “viewers must learn of and locate, usually via a search engine, and then must browse through to find one piece of information at a time” and “The user has undertaken a search... A list of applicable hotels with a retrieval bar then appeared in the key area” (line 67 of column 7, lines 1-2 of column 8 and lines 19-23 of column 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teaching of Barros to provide a way to present data on a web page. Because both Cheng and Armstrong discloses a device to navigate between linked web pages on a browser and can also be utilize on a page with search list provided by an Internet search engine disclosed by Barros to provide an improved way to navigate through those web pages.

21. Regarding claim 19, the statements presented above, with respect to claim 6 are incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 2676

22. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US 6,211,878; refer to as Cheng herein) and Armstrong (US 6,198,473) as applied to claims 3 and 16 above, and further in view of Bates et al. (US 5,877,766; refer to as Bates herein).

23. Regarding claim 7, the combination of Cheng and Armstrong does not disclose the set of linked pages is identified by a set of URLs held in web browser memory. Bates teaches a user interface for accessing a plurality of linked records that "many web browsers for example maintain a memory and/or hard disk cache of documents" (see lines 8-11 of column 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teaching of Bates to significantly increase the performance of web browsing (see lines 16-20 of column 28, Bates).

24. Regarding claim 20, the statements presented, above, with respect to claim 7 are incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-5, filed August 22, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Cheng.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2676

David Tenser discloses that by holding Shift key on the keyboard, scrolling up or down can activate Internet Explorer browser commands Forward and Back, respectively, "Firefox Help: Mouse Shortcuts" <http://texturizer.net/firefox/mouse.html>.

Inquiry


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Po-Wei (Dennis) Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8365. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew C Bella can be reached on (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Po-Wei (Dennis) Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2676

Po-Wei (Dennis) Chen
July 22, 2004



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600